

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the arguments below.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,761) in view of Spicer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,007,093). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Singhal and Spicer, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the every element of the claims. Singhal is directed towards enabling devices to roam throughout a network without losing connectivity. The roaming capability is accomplished in part by establishing network access points throughout, for example, a building. The access points coordinate with a central server that manages the movement of a device through the zones created by the different access points. See e.g., col. 2, lines 55-67.

Singhal accomplishes its goals by utilizing Handoff Management Points (HMP) possess two network interfaces. These network interfaces are used to send and receive network packets through the network environment. A central server communicates with the HMPs as the device roams through the network environment ensuring the network appears seamless to the roaming device. Application servers host various applications that a particular roaming device may use throughout the environment. The central server maintains two registries that assist with tracking the roaming devices. The registries contain data such as IP address, MAC addresses, active users, etc. that assist in this tracking process. See e.g., col. 4, lines 6-61.

Nothing in Singhal's disclosure is directed towards enabling a legacy application to communicate using virtual serial ports as claimed. Singhal does not teach or suggest the use of virtual serial port drivers to emulate a serial connection. Singhal does not mention using virtual ports to emulate any type of connection. Singhal's primary and only purpose is to provide an architecture that enables tracking of roaming devices. Singhal is exclusively directed towards locating and tracking roaming devices. Nothing in the Examiner's citations of Singhal disclose the concepts of using virtual serial ports or emulation. Thus, Singhal does not teach the elements of the present claims.

Spicer does not cure Singhal's deficiencies. The Examiner has cited Spicer for creating a service record corresponding to an application; and registering in the service record a service name identifying the application, wherein the service name is provided by a virtual serial port driver. Nothing in Spicer teaches or suggests using virtual serial ports. Spicer is directed towards providing a convenient method for enable network access to a number of network resources while abstracting the device type and network address. To enable this access, Spicer uses network registries. Simplified, these registries are databases containing user access levels associated with various network resources on a network. See e.g., col. 1, line 66-col. 4, line 3.

While Singhal and Spicer may be combined, the combination does not teach or suggest the using of virtual serial ports emulating serial connections to enable legacy application access. Any such teaching is solely derived from the Applicant's disclosure and nothing contain in the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: September 16, 2009

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860

By: /Shawn Diedtrich/

Shawn Diedtrich
Registration No. 58,176